



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/885,721	06/20/2001	John G. Babisch	T9667	3304

20551 7590 01/02/2002

THORPE NORTH WESTERN
8180 SOUTH 700 EAST, SUITE 200
P.O. BOX 1219
SANDY, UT 84070

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

MELLER, MICHAEL V

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

1651

DATE MAILED: 01/02/2002

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/885,721	BABISH ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael V. Meller	1651

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-50 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 43-50 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some *
 - c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3)<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4)<input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____. 5)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6)<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.
---	---

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-42, drawn to a composition, classified in class 424, subclass 750, for example.
- II. Claims 43-47, drawn to a first method of using the composition, classified in class 514, subclass 783, for example.
- III. Claim 48, drawn to a second method of using the composition, classified in class 514, subclass 886, for example.
- IV. Claim 49, drawn to a fourth method of using the composition, classified in class 514, subclass 859, for example.
- V. Claim 50, drawn to a fifth method of using the composition, classified in class 424, subclass 725, for example.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product can be used in a materially distinct process such as treating AIDS.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: the many different components, i.e. alpha acids, beta acids, etc.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1, 9, 18, 26, and 34 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the

case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

During a telephone conversation with Wayne Western on 12/10/2001 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-42 and for component I, the alpha-acid, humulone and for component II, the beta-acid, lupulone. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 43-50 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Inventions II-V are related as different methods from one another. They are patentably distinct since it is clear that many different methods can use the same composition as is evidenced by the claims themselves.

Invention I and II-V are related as product and processes of uses. They can be used for different processes as is evidenced by the claims themselves and can be used in different processes such as treating diseases, such as AIDS, cancer, etc.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 11-15, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Haas.

Hass teaches a composition containing hop extract which contains lupolone and humulone and sweetners, see col. 1, line 63-col. 2, line 30, see also example. See also Versluys which clearly shows that hops contain both humulones and lupulones, see col. 1, lines 10-15.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haas taken with Versluys and Todd, Jr.

The teachings of Haas are above. Haas does not teach the specific amounts of lupulone and humulone, that the hop is CO₂ extracted and that ~~and that~~ a vitamin such as vitamin C is used in the composition.

Versluys teaches that vitamin C is used as an antioxidant to prevent the deterioration of hops, see claims, col. 1, lines 10-15.

Todd teaches that the hop in beer is routinely CO₂ extracted, see col. 1, line 1-col. 2, line 60, examples, etc.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to CO₂ extract the hops of Haas since Todd teaches that this is routinely done to hops. CO₂ extraction provides products which do not have solvents in them and thus is more desirable to consumers than using solvents, see Todd, see col. 2, lines 25-50. Further, it would have been obvious to use vitamin C in the composition since vitamin C is clearly desirable to use when one wants to keep hops from deteriorating as evidenced by Versluys. One would clearly want to prevent the hops from deteriorating thus there is motivation to use the vitamin C.

To use the specific amounts of lupulone and humulone also would have been obvious since the adjustment of particular conventional working parameters (e.g., determining result effective amounts of the ingredients beneficially taught by the cited references, especially within the broad ranges instantly claimed), is deemed merely a matter of judicious selection and routine optimization which is well within the purview of the skilled artisan.

Accordingly, this type of modification would have been well within the purview of the skilled artisan and no more than an effort to optimize results.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael V. Meller whose telephone number is 703-308-4230. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday: 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Wityshyn can be reached on 703-308-4743. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-0294 for regular communications and 703-308-0294 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.



Michael V. Meller
Examiner
Art Unit 1651

MVM
December 29, 2001